

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4–6, 8, 9, and 11–13 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended, and claims 3, 7, and 10 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1–3 and 7–10

In Section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1–3 and 7–10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over Salmonsén (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0225568; hereinafter referred to as “Salmonsén”).

In the Background section of the Specification, a need is stated by the inventor for “support for large magnetic removable devices by treating the removable magnetic media as if it were a removable optical device. ...[A]n optical interface puts removable magnetic media on par to compete with the Optical drive industry such as CD/DVD type devices, rather than being compared to the hard drive industry.” *Specification, paragraph 4.*

To address the problem stated above, embodiments of the present invention provide methods and systems of interfacing a removable magnetic media system “utilizing the command set normally associated with CD/DVD type devices ... [which] are documented in the MMC specification.” *Specification, paragraph 5.*

For example, method claim 1, as presented herein, includes:

configuring a removable magnetic media system to use an optical drive interface to communicate with the operating system;

using an optical drive file system to enable communication between the removable magnetic media system and the operating system; and

performing read and write operations to the removable magnetic media system using MMC commands used by the optical drive file system.

Accordingly, one aspect of claim 1 includes at least performing read and write operations to a removable magnetic media system using MMC commands used by the optical drive file system. That is, reads and writes to an information storage device are performed using CD/DVD type commands (MMC) which are used by the optical file system (*see Specification, paragraph 21*), where the information storage device is a removable magnetic media system.

By contrast, Salmonsens discloses an emulator that can “receive signals from an external source such as Ethernet from PC and convert the signals so that [an] MPEG decoder functions as if receiving signals from a standard supply device such as CD or DVD ...” *Salmonsens, paragraph 31*. (emphasis added) Salmonsens thus converts signals in a first format compatible with transmission from a PC into signals in a second format consistent with signals that might be received from a CD or DVD device. However, Salmonsens fails to teach or suggest using MMC commands to perform read and write operations with a removable magnetic media system using an optical drive file system. Salmonsens thus fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 as amended herein.

Based on the foregoing discussion, claim 1 should be allowable over Salmonsens. Further, since independent claim 8 parallels claim 1 and recites similar limitations as recited therein, claim 8 should also be allowable over Salmonsens. Furthermore, since claims 2 and 9 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, claims 2 and 9 should also be allowable over

Salmonsens. Claims 3, 7, and 10 have been canceled by this amendment.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1–3 and 7–10 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 4, 6, 11 and 13

In Section 7 of the Office Action, claims 4, 6, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmonsens in view of the “Universal Disk Format Specification” (referred to hereinafter as “UDF Specification”).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding independent claims 1 and 8, and since claims 4, 6, 11, and 13 depend from one of claims 1 and 8, claims 4, 6, 11, and 13 should also be allowable over Salmonsens. The Office Action states that the UDF Specification “teaches a standard comprising: writing packets of 64KB with 2K sectors ... and supporting multi-volume” *Office Action, page 5, line 1*. Even assuming that the UDF Specification discloses writing packets of 64KB with 2K sectors and supporting multi-volume, the UDF Specification as cited fails to teach or suggest using MMC commands to perform read and write operations with a removable magnetic media system using an optical drive file system. Therefore, since claims 4, 6, 11, and 13 should be allowable over Salmonsens as discussed above, Salmonsens and the UDF Specification, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 4, 6, 11, and 13.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 4, 6, 11 and 13 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 5 and 12

In Section 8 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salmonsens in view of Zou et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,058,284; hereinafter referred to as “Zou”).

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding independent claims 1 and 8, and since claims 5 and 12 depend from one of claims 1 and 8, claims 5 and 12 should also be allowable over Salmonsens. As to Zou, the Office Action states, “Zou teaches a system and a method comprising the automatic running of a optical disk when the disk is inserted into the disk drive (col. 1, ll. 57–60).” *Office Action, page 5, lines 10–11*. Even assuming that Zou discloses automatically running an optical disk, Zou yet fails to teach or suggest using MMC commands to perform read and write operations with a removable magnetic media system using an optical drive file system. Therefore, since claims 5 and 12 should be allowable over Salmonsens as discussed above, Salmonsens and Zou, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 5 and 12.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 5 and 12 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 4–6, 8, 9, and 11–13 in view of the amendments and remarks herein and submit that all pending claims are presently in condition for allowance.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account **50-2075**.

Respectfully submitted,
Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch

Dated: October 27, 2006

By: /Charles E. Eggers/
Charles E. Eggers,
Reg. No. 56,343

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900
Customer No. **27189**